

Action Item

*Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

Approval of the Minutes of the July 22, 2002, Meeting

---



---

---

# MINUTES

## *Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

Meeting of July 22, 2002

---

**Committee members present** Evonne Seron Schulze, *Chair*  
Odessa P. Johnson, *Vice Chair*  
Susan Hammer  
Rachel E. Shetka  
Anthony M. Vitti\*  
Howard Welinsky  
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*  
Carol Chandler, *ex officio*

**Other Commissioners present**

Lance Izumi  
Olivia K. Singh

**Committee members absent** Irwin S. Field  
Kyo “Paul” Jhin  
Melinda G. Wilson

\*Arrived after roll call.

---

**Call to order** Committee Chair Schulze called the Educational Policy and Programs Committee to order at 9:40 a.m.

---

**Roll call** Executive Secretary Anna Gomez called the roll and the following committee members were not present: Field, Jhin, and Wilson.

---

**Approval of the minutes** The minutes of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee of June 4, 2002, were approved with a change to identify Joan Sallee as “Staff” on page 4.

---

**Priorities for California Educational Technology Funding: A Report in Response to AB 1123** Deputy Director Leveille presented the report. He stated that the report had been edited for more cohesion and better flow since its first presentation to the Commission at its meeting on June 4, 2002. He noted that the report focuses on budget priorities that the Legislature should consider, based on system initiatives, with the objective of developing good policy decisions related to educational technology and distance education.

Deputy Director Leveille further informed the committee members of the continuing engagement of Commission staff in efforts to monitor ongoing activities in this arena (see

page 19 of the report). He also noted two important funding priorities (on page 20); (1) the need to accommodate enrollment at the undergraduate level, and (2) the need to collaborate with K-12. As part of the final editing of the report, Deputy Director Leveille stated that the seven recommendations on pages 20 and 21 were not listed with regard to any priority order and that they would not be numbered in the final version of the report. A copy of revised language for the Executive Summary and other sections of the report were provided as handouts.

Chair Schulze expressed her appreciation for the cleanup of the report language and staff's responsiveness to Commissioner input, especially with regard to the two priority areas noted.

Commissioner Hammer asked whether the continuing activities listed on page 19 of the report require additional legislation to implement. Deputy Director Leveille replied in the negative unless any of the activities should subsequently be required by the Master Plan.

Commissioner Hammer then asked what was required to move the recommendations forward. Deputy Director Leveille replied what was needed was Commission adoption and distribution of the report to the legislature, and that staff would continue its data collection efforts.

Commissioner Hammer commented that this is an ambitious project given the Commission's budget, staffing and priorities. Deputy Director Leveille replied that Interim Executive Director Moore would present a list of agency priorities at the October Commission meeting. Executive Director Moore added that all the postsecondary segments have education technology efforts and that the Commission may be more effective by tying in to projects and initiatives that we want to promote. Commissioner Vitti advised the agency not to get too involved in implementation, suggesting that the Governmental Relations Committee follow up should any implementing legislation be proposed in the future. Deputy Director Leveille commented that future efforts would not be pursued alone, noting that efforts to date are the result of University and State University work that the Commission will collaborate to pull things together.

Commissioner Vitti asked where the oversight would come from. Deputy Director Leveille replied that the Commission would provide oversight in collaboration with the segments.

Seeking to add clarity, Chair Schulze inquired about the origin of the study, stating that the Commission was directed to do the study and that the project's advisory committee came up with the recommendations.

Deputy Director Leveille confirmed that the report was the product of the advisory committee's input. He reminded the Commissioners that the advisory committee had segmental, business, and national representatives in its composition. He added that the report is responsive to the legislation and, in addition, has been animated by Commission staff as well as by the review of national initiatives in response to interest by the author and legislative staff.

Commissioner Johnson asked how the segments are affected by the report. Deputy Director Leveille replied that the Legislature had asked the Commission to give it guidance on funding priorities. Director Moore added that there will be “buy-in” by the segments as they use these principles in their own funding initiatives.

A motion to adopt the report was approved unanimously.

---

<b>Recess/Reconvene</b>	The meeting was recessed at 10:20 a.m. to set up for the next presentation and was reconvened at 10:35 a.m.
-------------------------	---

---

**California High  
School Outreach  
Program Inventory**

Staff member Cheryl Hickey led the presentation of this agenda item. She reminded the Commissioners of the 2001-02 budget language that directed CPEC to do the study; that this was not an evaluation of outreach programs; and that although it was originally a two-year study, budget restrictions allowed only one year of funding which resulted in a reduced scope for the study. Ms. Hickey commended the consultant, MGT of America, stating that they had done great work with little time. She added that individual copies of the report were limited but that the full report would be posted on the CPEC website, recognizing and thanking Commission technology staff for their work in this regard.

Ms. Hickey then introduced two representatives from MGT who were involved in the survey and who gave a PowerPoint slide presentation of their findings. Copies of the slide presentation were provided as handouts.

Commission Chair Arkatov expressed his concern about the lack of response to the survey and asked whether the big school districts responded. The MGT consultant replied that none of the big districts responded. Chair Arkatov stated that this was appalling and that there should be consequences for lack of responsiveness.

Committee Chair Schulze stated that the programs were using “lack of funding” as an excuse. Commission Chair Arkatov suggested that in the future, there could be an additional set-aside to encourage participation.

Director Moore stated that we need to know what data we lack, suggesting that there are ways and different approaches to getting needed data. Commissioner Hammer asked if we have demographic information on the schools with these programs. The MGT consultant replied in the affirmative but added that it was limited to the responding schools.

In reaction to a slide statement that a majority of schools have a mix of programs, Commissioner Hammer asked if there is a correlation between those schools that have a mix of programs and API scores. The MGT consultant replied that there were more programs in low performing schools. Commissioner Hammer then asked if any students were cross-enrolled in programs at their schools. The MGT consultant replied that they were unable to determine cross-enrollment figures.

Commissioners Chandler and Johnson noted that there is a space on the UC application for students to indicate outreach program participation, so related data is available.

Ms. Hickey ended her presentation by stating that there is no follow-up required on this item. In light of the fact that this was Ms. Hickey's last day on staff, Chair Schulze stated that follow-up questions should be directed to Karl Engelbach.

Commissioner Johnson also expressed her concern about the low response rate, stating that the data is critical to prove to the Legislature that the investment in outreach programs is worth it.

The following is a summary of comments from three interested parties who attended the meeting and who provided public comments on the report: Diana Fuentes-Michel, CCC Vice Chancellor of Governmental Relations and External Affairs (former Director of Public Affairs for the Department of Educational Outreach within the University of California); Natalie Stites, Deputy Secretary for Higher Education; and Penny Edgert, Coordinator of the California Education Round Table's Intersegmental Coordinating Council.

Ms. Fuentes-Michel began by clarifying the impetus of the report from former Secretary of Education John Mockler's concern and goal to have outreach services made available to every student in every high school and stating that the goal has been achieved over the past three years. She stated that the Davis administration has supported funding this goal but recent budget constraints have eliminated this support. With that in mind, Ms. Fuentes-Michel added that the University has embarked on collaborative partnerships (including funding from the federal No Child Left Behind Act) to provide funding in the absence of state support. In her view, the report's good news is that low-performing schools are getting most of the services, but that it is unknown which students -- high-end or low-end -- are getting the help on each high school campus. In her new role as CCC Vice Chancellor, Ms. Fuentes-Michel reported she is encouraged that there are new programs and a new staff person dedicated to outreach programs within the CCC Chancellor's Office.

Ms. Stites commented that the report will be useful in support of the Governor's education agenda and that it will be important to dissect how funding affects these programs and whether they are doing what they should; whether the funding is effective vis-à-vis the goals. Ms. Stites added that the State needs to prioritize funding and get good advice from CPEC.

Ms. Edgert congratulated MGT on doing a good job in little time and expressed her appreciation that the report acknowledges distinctions between individual outreach programs, incorporating constructive criticism provided from the field. She continued by informing the Commissioners that CPEC has reviewed these programs over the years (the last report in December 1996). In her view, the problem is that all outreach programs, combined, serve only nine percent of the students who need it.

Ms. Fuentes-Michel interjected that one out of every three underrepresented students at the University participated in one of these outreach programs.

Ms. Edgert continued with a concern about wording in the report that could be misconstrued by program opponents. She provided two examples. First, regarding a statement on 'coordination' the report states "... It is difficult to assess the degree of col-

laboration among the programs” when the survey did not ask for data on this issue. Second, regarding fiscal statements, Ms. Edgert offered that if the focus of the program is to support schools’ internal activities that enhance college preparation, then external collaboration is not an issue.

Ms. Fuentes-Michel ended the public comments by stating that there are a lot of new and continuing activities going on out in the field.

Chair Arkatov expressed his thanks for the public comments. He continued by stating that concerns remain and that there needs to be good, detailed data available. He expressed the Commission’s interest in working with the Secretary of Education in the next legislative session to assess effectiveness and that giving CPEC the tools to accomplish that would be helpful.

Commissioner Hammer offered that it is not just a question of funding, but that getting the information to students that these services are available is just as important. She added that San Jose Unified School District has adopted mandatory UC and CSU admission requirements for all high school graduates in the district. In her view, that is another piece of the puzzle.

Committee Chair Schulze stated that a college-degree holder puts \$4 million back into the economy as opposed to \$1 million for a high school graduate over their lifetime. High school counselors should encourage college going which they are not doing now. Commissioner Hammer commented on the additional disadvantage of some schools that don’t offer any Advanced Placement courses.

Chair Arkatov stated that everything is a piece of the puzzle and that there is a need to go deeper. When programs want funding, they should serve the needs of the state.

Ms. Fuentes-Michel suggested that CPEC focus on the two-silo foci of (academic) college-going or postsecondary vocational education. Ms. Hickey ended the presentation by urging the Commissioners to include further work on this issue in their consideration of CPEC’s future priorities.

---

**Adjournment**    Chair Schulze adjourned the Committee meeting at 11:45 a.m.

---